



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Your ref : Path Remap II (UK)
Application No: GB0414075.2
Applicant : Symbian Software Ltd
Latest date for reply: 23 June 2005

Examiner : Mr Ben Buchanan
Tel : 01633 814742
Date of report : 5 August 2004
Page 1/2

Patents Act 1977

Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 & 18(3)

Novelty and inventive step

1. The invention as defined in claims 1-4 & 8-13 is not new, or would appear to lack an inventive step, because it has already been disclosed in, or would appear to be obvious following consideration of, the following documents:

US 6185580 B1 (IBM)
EP 1122647 A1 (HEWLETT-PACKARD)
EP 0526035 A1 (AT&T)

2. IBM describes allowing 'a host computer to directly access data from a different host type', for example across different operating systems (col.1 lines 48-53). This is done by means of a 'PIE' file which contains metadata mapping one file system to another. Thus claims 1, 3, & 8-12 would seem to be anticipated. Claim 2 would appear to be an obvious modification.

3. HEWLETT-PACKARD is listed on the priority search report and appears to anticipate the present main claims at least, as these are little changed from the scope of the prior claims. FAT file systems are explicitly described (p.4 line 27) according to claim 13. HEWLETT-PACKARD explicitly describes 'translating' file path names by string manipulation, and so would appear to anticipate or suggest the matter of claims 1, 4, 11, 12 & 13 at least.

4. Notwithstanding any lack of novelty in respect of claims 1 & 11, AT&T describes stripping elements of a path name to effect access to different directories in a hierarchy. AT&T may therefore suggest a lack of inventive step in respect of translating path names, versus claims 1 & 11 at least.

Scope of the claims

5. Claim 12 is broad and presently extends beyond any statement of invention. Although the description limits embodiments of the invention to improving interoperability between operating systems by mapping or translating between file system hierarchies, claim 12 is not so restricted. Claim 12 should be amended so as to clearly reflect the inventive concept of the other independent claims. The means by which the appearance of a 'known



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Your ref : Path Remap II (UK)
Application No : GB0414075.2

Date of report: 5 August 2004
Page 2 / 2

[Examination Report contd.]

supported hierarchy' is created should be made clear in the claim so that its scope is unambiguously defined.

6. In claim 1, 'the second directory hierarchy' has no antecedent.